



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Those limitations and this embarrassment produced in their turn some beneficial changes in the constitution of the Baptist denomination. A tendency towards centralization had been developing very strongly in the General Convention. In 1817 the body had taken up the work of home missions in addition to foreign missions, and later it had assumed the burdens and management of Columbian College. When the crash befell in 1826, this tendency to centralization was checked and crushed. The General Convention washed its hands of the cause of home missions and also of the cause of education. Columbian College was set adrift to provide for itself, and the work of home missions was discontinued until the year 1832 when a separate and independent society was organized to care for it. The Publication Society was likewise able to maintain a separate and independent existence, and in 1888 the American Baptist Education Society, another separate and independent institution, was established to provide for the interests of Baptist learning. The failures of Luther Rice left as broad and beneficent a mark upon the constitution and history of the Baptist denomination as his successes. American Baptists have never yet done justice to the colossal figure of that extraordinary man.

The second Church of Swansea, Mass., referred to by Professor Vedder in a footnote on page 54, is the body mentioned by Benedict, *History of the Baptists*, Boston, 1813, I. 427, and not the body mentioned by Backus, I. 450.

WM. H. WHITSITT.

The Making of Methodism: Studies in the Genesis of Institutions.

By JOHN J. TIGERT, D.D., LL.D., Editor of the *Methodist Review*. (Nashville: Barbee and Smith. 1898. Pp. xiv, 175.)

DR. TIGERT is well known to students of American church history as the author of a very able *Constitutional History of American Episcopal Methodism*. The present work treats the same themes topically instead of chronologically. It comprises in all thirteen chapters. Two of these trace the origin and development of the peculiar Episcopacy of American Methodism, two are devoted to the equally peculiar Presiding Eldership, three relate to the Itinerancy, five to the Genesis of the Annual and General Conferences, and one to the Baltimore Conference System of Government. The title of the book is, therefore, misleading. It treats not of the making of Methodism; but of Methodist ecclesiastical machinery. In the author's phrase, "it is a contribution to the correct construction of our governmental history."

This history is unfortunately crowded with controversy, the dust of which is evident enough in every treatment of it. Dr. Tigert has very definite views of "correct construction;" and these have colored or rather embroidered his account of bishops, presiding elders and ministers. We wish he had permitted the facts to speak for themselves. The value of the work, however, is in the chapters on the conferences and the splendid criticism of the sources of their history. The author has examined

these with great industry and candor, and this reviewer is pleased to verify some very important conclusions. Ezekiel Cooper's printed copy of the minutes of 1785 lies before him. Dr. Tigert did not know of its existence. It is, therefore, a striking proof of his critical sagacity that, as he infers, it *does not contain the prefatory note of the reprinted minutes of 1795* and that the title-page corresponds exactly to Jesse Lee's description of it, viz.: *Minutes of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America*.

Competent judges will dispute none of Dr. Tigert's seven points touching the Christmas Conference; neither will they demur to his conclusion that the General Conference of 1792 was the creature of the yearly assemblies which created the ill-starred council. But the disquisition that follows abounds in needless refinements. The Christmas Conference that constituted the Methodist Episcopal Church in America did not, of course, abolish "the conference." It was itself "the conference" in extraordinary session. It governed subsequent conferences, so far as its work was allowed to stand, and its chief work has stood until this day. The creation of the ill-starred council interrupted the orderly development of "the conference" and might have disrupted the church. The General Conference of 1792 was a return to the fundamental principle implied in the action of 1784, the ultimate sovereignty of the itinerant ministry. And its provision for stated conferences of all the preachers was to prevent any such devices as the Baltimore System or the disrupted council. This, however, did not necessarily destroy the supremacy of the annual conferences. It made it unnecessary to assert it. Dr. Tigert himself points out that up to 1808 "the annual conferences assumed to be fully competent to remodel the superintendency at will." The General Conferences from 1792 to 1808 were convenient instruments only; servants and not masters of the annual conferences. Directly they attempted to be the masters, disruption was threatened; the Delegated General Conference created in 1808 averted the disaster.

All that Dr. Tigert writes about the Baltimore Conference system and the period between 1784 and 1792 is interesting and instructive. But his statement "that government by the conferences passed away forever in 1792" is rather sweeping. On the contrary, Bishop McKendree revived it in his famous appeal to the annual conferences against the action of 1820; he won his notable victory by a return to the early practice. And when assailed for it he defended himself with Asbury's example. And, if this reviewer is not in error, Dr. Tigert in his *Constitutional History* has maintained the validity of such an appeal.

Dr. Tigert never perverts and never suppresses a fact. He is wholly free from the tricks of controversialists. Nevertheless his prepossessions unconsciously determine his phrases, so that inference and narrative are blended sometimes inharmoniously. One of these prepossessions is the independence of the bishops from the authority of the General Conference. This gives a peculiar twist to his statements about them. Note the following, especially the metaphors:

"At this period (1807) little connected with the superintendency was regarded as organized, established, or permanent. Precipitation and crystallization occurred in 1808. At this time the constitution was established. It excepted episcopacy and the plan of General Superintendency from statutory modification by the General Conference." How deftly the clause "it excepted episcopacy" is introduced! Just as subtle is the other phrase "statutory modification." Now all that the constitution of 1808 determined was this: Diocesan episcopacy should never be adopted by the General Conference alone. The episcopacy has been modified. But Dr. Tigert calls this "development," and tells us frankly all about it. He tells us that Asbury maintained the right of the senior bishop to make all the appointments; that McKendree yielded to him the preliminary draft; that Asbury refused to consult the presiding elders; that McKendree refused to make appointments without them; that McKendree doubted the constitutionality of the present "necessary" system; that Bishop Soule's scruples were silenced at last only by the principle that necessity knows no law. He tells us moreover that the General Conference of 1824 passed a resolution allowing the bishops a choice between "episcopal departments" and "travelling in a circuit after each other." "The bishops," he adds, "took different views of *this action of the General Conference.*" A conflict between McKendree and George nearly ended in a rupture of the episcopacy and the church. So that "in 1832 *the General Conference sought again to give relief* and passed a resolution that they deemed it inexpedient to require each Bishop to travel throughout the church during the recess of the General Conference." To call this "development" rather than modification is an ostrich-like attempt to escape the facts. It were wiser to follow Ranke's rule and to tell just how things happened.

Nevertheless, this is a noteworthy and invaluable book. No student of American church history can afford to neglect it; and every student of Methodist history will find it indispensable. It is replete with information, accessible hitherto to very few, and is marked throughout with rare insight and logical ability.

CHARLES J. LITTLE.

The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom. By WILBUR H. SIEBERT, Associate Professor of European History in Ohio State University. With an Introduction by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Professor of History in Harvard University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Pp. xxv, 478.)

No one before Professor Siebert has undertaken to make a survey of the whole field of operations of the philanthropists, Southern as well as Northern, who made organized efforts to guide and shelter fugitives from slavery. These efforts were necessarily secret, and it was unsafe to keep records. Fugitives were passed on from one station to another, over lines crossing the Canadian frontier at myriad points, from Michigan